



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Calaveras County Water District	County	Calaveras
Project Title	Phase 1: Stanislaus River Reconnaissance-Level Conjunctive Use Evaluation	Grant Request	\$ 249,105.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 249,105.00

Project Description: The Proposal evaluates the feasibility of conjunctive use in the Stanislaus River watershed through assessment of upstream surface water availability and groundwater storage.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	4
Schedule	4
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	35

- **GWMP or Program:** The Applicant included the Integrated Regional Groundwater Management Plan (IRGMP) for the Modesto sub-Basin, which was adopted by Oakdale Irrigation District (OID). The IRWMP covers the area within the OID sphere of influence, which will be assessed for potential groundwater recharge and storage projects. The IRGMP was formally adopted on August 2, 2005.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant includes a complete and detailed description to support the goal of evaluating the feasibility of conjunctive use in the Stanislaus River watershed. To accomplish this goal, the Applicant plans to estimate CCWD's upstream surface water availability while assessing the groundwater recharge and storage opportunities downstream in OID's sub-basin. The Applicant indicates that no facilities are planned, but that existing information regarding the potential for conjunctive management of ground and surface water will be collected and evaluated. The proposal demonstrates collaboration between two local public agencies to share benefits conjunctively, both upstream and downstream, between each agency's political boundaries. The Applicant proposes that data gathered from the feasibility study will be used to assess whether the Applicant should invest in future conjunctive use development in the area of the project. The proposal demonstrates that the feasibility study will produce a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge and is consistent with six specific BMOs outlined in the project's GWMP. The Applicant indicates that because the project will result in a series of reports that will inform future decision-making on appropriate conjunctive use projects, no ongoing funding will be necessary.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant's Work Plan describes in sufficient detail that a conjunctive use study is proposed through eight tasks and includes sections with subtasks consistent with those in both the Schedule and Budget. The proposed tasks reasonably fulfill the three objectives outlined in the proposal which relate to improving GW management by furthering six BMOs outlined in the GWMP. The Applicant presents a strong strategy for evaluating progress, by including key deliverables throughout in addition to incorporating a project management task that details submission of monthly status and quarterly progress reports. The Applicant indicates that because the project consists of data collection, evaluation, and assessment, that access to private property will not be required. Furthermore, since no construction is proposed, CEQA and permitting will not apply to the project. Finally, Task 2 (Stakeholder Outreach) demonstrates that the proposal provides for adequate dissemination among the public, stakeholders, and agencies, of project progress.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The Applicant's Budget does not include sufficient explanatory text to demonstrate the costs are realistic. In addition, the Applicant does not adequately document the ODC category to explain what the costs will include, or document sub-consultant costs. The Applicant provides a budget that is not fully consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule. For example, Task 3 includes six line-items in the Budget, whereas the Schedule includes five line-items, and for Task 7, there are three line-items in the budget, but five in the Work Plan. The Applicant adequately provides a breakdown of the costs by subtask and shows that the grant will cover the entire cost for the project. The Budget does not identify other sources of funding.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed but not fully documented. The Applicant's schedule includes timelines that do not seem entirely realistic. For instance, it is not clear why a sub-task under Task 7, (Prepare Admin Draft Report and Executive Summary) ends before a subtask under Task 2 (Prepare Draft Report section). The Applicant should provide an explanation to clarify why the preferred order is desirable or necessary. However, the Applicant presents appropriate detailed tasks that support how the Schedule was derived and shows that the project be completed within the required 2-year timeframe. The Applicant provided a proposed start date but did not specifically assure that it will be ready to proceed when funding is available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and includes thorough and well-presented documentation. The proposal's Quality Assurance measures include some well-defined project specific data quality objectives and appropriate QA/QC. The Applicant provides well-documented personnel qualifications, and standardized methodologies for the modeling system, such as AACE. However, the Applicant neglects to include and explain QA/QC measures for the existing data that it will attempt to collect on which the project findings and recommendations will rely.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Applicant provides description of a past LGA project, but no specific information on the performance of the applicant in terms of the extent that the grant requirements were successfully completed and whether the Applicant was successful in managing the funds and meeting deadlines for similar types of projects. The applicant did not provide back-up documentation affirming that it successfully managed a grant.